DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 128 936 EA 008 709

AUTHOR Crim, Roger D.; Bownes, Malcolm
TITLE Needs Assessment for Staff Development Report.
PUB DATE Oct 75
NOTE 57p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Northeastern Educational Research Association (Ellenville, New York, October, 1975); For a related document, see ED106271

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Attitudes; Educational Objectives; *Needs Assessment; *Questionnaires; *Staff Improvement; Statistical Analysis; *Student Opinion; Students; *Teacher Attitudes; Teachers

ABSTRACT

To provide an adequate base of knowledge to use in developing a state-mandated master plan for New Hampshire Supervisory Union No. 30, subjective and objective data were obtained from the citizens, teachers, and students of the union. The following opinion surveys and needs assessments were conducted: community, teacher, and student opinion survey; teacher needs assessment; and student needs assessment. The opinionnaire was used to find out if the surveyed groups felt the Union's schools were successful in teaching 12 educational goals and if teaching toward the goals was a responsibility of the local public schools, the home, or both. The teacher needs assessment was used to determine the priorities of teachers' professional needs in respect to 18 innovations, techniques, and needs. Only objective test or diagnostic data were used in the student needs survey that covered academic and physical and mental health areas. The instruments and results are presented in appendixes. (Author/IRT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED128936

NEEDS ASSESSMENT FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT REPORT

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by

Roger D. Crim
Assistant Professor of Education
Plymouth State College

Malcolm Bownes
Assistant Professor of Education
Plymouth State College

Paper Presented to

Northeastern Educational Research Association

Annual Meeting

Ellenville, New York

October 30, 1975

EA 008 709

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the guidelines established by the New Hampshire State Department of Education, survey and needs assessment research was conducted under the direction of the Staff Development Committee of Supervisory Union No. 30. Article II, Section 2, of "Staff Development for Educational Personnel: State of New Hampshire," states that

> 2. A local three (3) year MASTER PLAN shall be developed to reflect specific needs identified through organized self-study and analysis by the professional staff, students, and parents. Both objective (test) data and subjective (questionnaire) data are appropriate to needs assessment. Specific objectives should be stated in measurable terms whenever possible.[1]

To provide an adequate base of knowledge to utilize for the development of the master plan for Supervisory Union No. 30, subjective and objective data was obtained from the citizens, teachers, and students of the Union. The following opinion surveys and needs assessments were conducted:

1. Community, Teacher, and Student Opinion Survey
2. Teacher Needs Assessment
3. Student Needs Assessment

---

[1] "Staff Development for Educational Personnel: State of New Hampshire." (Concord, N.H.: Office of Teacher Education and Professional Standards, State Department of Education, June, 1971). (MIMEOGRAPHED.) Hereafter referred to as "Staff Development."

COMMUNITY, TEACHER, AND STUDENT OPINION SURVEY

Educational Goals

To obtain the opinion of the community, teachers, and students with respect to the goals of the public schools within the community, an opinionnaire was developed.[2] The base for the twelve goals identified in the instrument were the 'Seven Cardinal Principals of Education"[3] as set forth by the Commission on Reorganization of Secondary Education (1922): health, command of fundamental processes, worthy home membership, vocation, civic education, worthy use of leisure time, and ethical character.

The twelve goals of public education identified by the Staff Development Committee for the opinionnaire were:

To gain a general education.

To develop skills in reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

To develop a desire for learning now and in the future.

To gain information needed to make job selections.

To develop skills to enter a specific field of work.

To learn to examine and to use information.

To understand and practice the skills of family living.

To develop pride in work and feeling of self-worth.

To learn to use leisure time.

---

[2]See Appendix A, pp. 24, 25, 26.

[3]James A. Johnson and others, The Foundations of American Education (2d ed.; Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1973), p. 269.

To practice and understand the ideas of health and safety.

To learn good citizenship.

To appreciate culture and beauty in the world.

The Committee wished to know if the community, teachers, and students felt the Union's schools were successful in teaching the identified goals (Part I of opinionnaire), and if teaching toward the goals was a responsibility of the local public schools, the home, or both (Part II of opinionnaire).

Community Opinion Survey

Pilot Study. A pilot study was conducted to establish the validity of the developed instrument. Ten citizens of the Union were selected for the pilot study.

Population for Survey. For the community opinion survey the population was identified as: citizens of Laconia, citizens of Gilford, and citizens of Gilmanton. The citizens of Laconia were those year-round residents of the Laconia School District as identified and listed in the Laconia Directory: 1974.[4] The citizens of Gilford were the year-round residents of Gilford as identified and listed in the Laconia Directory: 1974.[5] And the citizens of Gilmanton were those residents identified as registered voters of Gilmanton.[6]

For the community survey a seven percent sample of each of the three strata was deemed adequate - five percent being minimal for this type of

---

[4]Laconia Directory: 1974 (Greenfield, Mass.: H. A. Manning Co., 1974), pp. 173-314.

[5]Ibid., pp. 402-451.

[6]Gilmanton Voter Registration Check List, November, 1974.

research.[7] The sample was determined by the simple random technique[8] of utilizing a table of computer generated random numbers.[9] The identified community population was 13,163, thus the size of the sample was 897.

Administration of Opinionnaire. The opinionnaire was mailed to the selected citizens of the Union on January 3, 1975. Along with the instrument a letter of transmittal and a postage paid, addressed envelope were enclosed. To increase the rate of return two follow-up mailings were planned. Each postage paid, addressed envelope was coded so that a record was maintained of those citizens responding.

Having received only a 19.4 percent return for the initial mailing, a second opinionnaire (along with a letter of transmittal and a postage paid, addressed envelope) was posted on January 20, 1975. The rate of response to the second mailing was 11.4 percent which made a total response rate of 30.8 percent.

On February 7, 1974, a postal card was sent to those citizens who had so far failed to respond. They were asked to participate in the survey by returning an opinionnaire immediately. An additional 6.1 percent responded by March 5, 1975, making the final rate of return 36.9 percent (N = 331).

---

[7] Letter from Dr. Bruce Weigle, Research Assistant, Bureau of Educational Research, University of Mississippi, November 10, 1974.

[8] Walter R. Borg and Meredith D. Gall, Educational Research (2d ed.; New York: David McKay, 1974), p. 117.

[9] Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (2d ed.; New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973), pp. 714-717.

Teacher Opinion Survey

Pilot Study. A pilot study was implemented to establish the validity of the instrument. Ten Union teachers were selected for the pilot study.

Population for Survey. The professional staff of the three districts comprising the Union was identified and utilized as the population for this survey.[10] A ten percent, simple random sample was selected from each of the three strata. The identified population was 244, thus the size of the sample was 25.

Administration of Opinionnaire. The opinionnaire, along with a letter of transmittal, was delivered to the various schools and selected teachers on December 17, 1974. Two days later the completed instruments were collected. Each instrument was coded so that a follow-up could be conducted to ensure a high return rate. However, follow-up procedures were not necessary due to a 96 percent return rate (N = 24).

Student Opinion Survey

Pilot Study. A pilot study was implemented to establish the validity of the instrument. Ten Union students (grades 7-12) were selected for the pilot study.

Population for Survey. The students in grades 7-12 in the schools of the three districts of the Union were identified and utilized as the population for this survey.[11]

---

[10] A list of the professional staff by district, school, and position was provided by the Superintendent of Schools.

[11] A list of the students in grades 7-12 in the schools of the Union was provided by the Superintendent of Schools.

A ten percent, simple random sample was selected from each strata. The identified student population was 2330, thus the sample size was 234.

Administration of Opinionnaire. The opinionnaires, along with a letter of transmittal, were delivered to the various schools and selected students on December 17, 1974. Three days later the completed instruments were collected. Each instrument was coded so that a follow-up could be conducted to ensure a high return rate. However, follow-up procedures were not necessary due to a 84 percent return rate (N = 197).

Analysis of Data

Chi-Square. The results of the opinionnaire produced an abundance of data which were used to answer the questions posed in the study. The responses of the community, teachers, and students served as the criterion in this study. The assumption was that the perception of these individuals would represent useful evidence since they would be based on direct, personal experience and observation.

The frequency of given responses of the community, teachers, and students to the twenty-four items of the opinionnaire was computed for each item and for each group. These results are given in Appendix B, pages 27, 28, 29. The responses were then analyzed to determine the divergence among the three groups. Significant differences from these analyses were determined to provide conclusions pertaining to the divergence of the respondents at the .05 level of

confidence. The nonparametric chi-square (X^2) statistic[12] was used as a test of this significance because only frequency data were used.

For the twelve items in Part I the .05 percent level of significance with eight degrees of freedom required a crossbreak analysis using a chi-square test of independence of 15.507[13] to be significant. For the twelve items in Part II the .05 level of significance with four degrees of freedom required a crossbreak analysis using a chi-square test of independence of 9.4877[14] to be significant. Statistical computations revealed that only four of the twenty-four items treated were not significant at[15] the .05 percent level.[16] It was then assumed that the three groups did differ significantly in their responses to the items. Consequently, responses of the community, teachers, and students were treated separately to determine mean values. Mean scores were used to determine the dissimilarity of opinions.

Weighted Means. To establish the extent of the dissimilarity of opinions of the three groups towards the twelve items of Part I, a mean score was calculated as follows: for each group, the total of responses under each item variable was

---

[12] N. M. Downie and R. W. Heath, Basic Statistical Methods (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), pp. 205-206.

[13] Ibid., p. 311.

[14] Ibid., p. 311.

[15] In every case at least one cell had an expected frequency of less than 5. The chi-squares computed may not be reliable.

[16] See Appendix C, pp. 30, 31.

multiplied by a variable number from +2 to -2. The sum of products of the five intervals was divided by the total number of responses (N) carried out to the nearest thousandth. For example, using item 1, "Gain a general education," the mean was calculated as shown in Table I. Similarly, means for each item in Part I and for each group were computed to provide the means which were used to compare the opinions of the three groups in reporting the data relevant to the questions under examination.[17]

TABLE I

MEAN SCORE CALCULATED FOR ITEM 1, PART I

Scale Variable	Excellent (+2)	Above Average (+1)	Average (0)	Below Average (-1)	Very Poor (-2)	Product Sum
Total Community Responses (N = 221)	20	58	130	8	5	
PRODUCT	40	58	0	-8	-10	+80

Community Mean = Sum of Products (+80)
divided by total responses (221) = +0.362

[17]See Appendix D, pp. 32, 33, 34.

To establish the extent of the dissimilarity of opinions of the three groups towards the twelve items of Part II, a mean score was calculated as follows: for each group, the total of responses under each item variable was multiplied by a variable number from +1 to -1. The sum of products of the five intervals was divided by the total number of responses (N) carried out to the nearest thousandth. For example, using item 1, "Gain a general education," the mean was calculated as shown in Table II. Similarly, means for each item in Part II and for each group were computed to provide the means which were used to compare the opinions of the three groups in reporting the data relevant to the questions under examination.[18]

TABLE II

MEAN SCORE CALCULATED FOR ITEM 1, PART II

Scale Variable	School (+1)	Both (0)	Home (-1)	Product Sum
Total Community Responses (N = 253)	73	66	3	
PRODUCT	73	0	-3	+70

Community Mean = Sum of Products (+70)
divided by total responses (253) = +0.277

[18] See Appendix D, pp. 32, 33, 34.

Discrepant Areas. Discrepant areas were determined by comparing the four items in Part I with the lowest means (indicating least successfully being taught) with the four items in Part II with the highest means (indicating a high school responsibility). For example, using the mean responses of the community, the discrepant areas were calculated as shown in Table III. Similarly, discrepant areas were determined for the other two groups.[19]

TABLE III

DISCREPANT AREAS: COMMUNITY

RANK	PART I	PART II
1	7	5
2	5	2
3	4	4
4	12	6

Data Relevant to Questions Asked

Item #1: Gain a General Education. The community and teachers were in agreement that the schools were being successful at the "average" level, whereas the students indicated the "above average" level of success. All three groups indicated the goal as the responsibility of both the home and the school.

[19] See Appendix E, pp. 35, 36.

Item #2: Develop Skills in Reading, Writing, Speaking, and Listening. The community and teachers were in agreement that the schools were being successful at the "average" level, whereas the students indicated a higher level of success. All three groups indicated the goal was more the responsibility of the schools than the home.

Item #3: Develop a Desire for Learning Now and in the Future. All three groups were in agreement that the schools were being successful at the "average" level and that the goal was the joint responsibility of the home and the school.

Item #4: Gain Information Needed to Make Job Selections. Between the three groups there was great disagreement as to the success of the schools. The community indicating a slight negative level, the teachers a slight positive level, and the students an "average" to "above average" level of success. There was agreement as to the responsibility of the schools. The success/responsibility of this goal was indicated as a discrepant area by the community.

Item #5: Develop Skills to Enter a Specific Field of Work. The community and teachers indicated a slight negative level of success, whereas the students indicated a slight positive level of success. There was strong agreement between the three groups that the goal was the responsibility of the school. The success/responsibility of this goal was indicated as a discrepant area by all three groups.

Item #6: Learn to Examine and to Use Information. There was no agreement of the groups as to the level of success. The students indicated an "above average" level, the teachers a slight positive level, and the community a slight negative

level of success. All three groups indicated that the responsibility belonged with the school.

Item #7: Understand and Practice the Skills of Family Living. The community and teachers indicated an almost "below average" level of success and the students a slight negative level. As to responsibility, the community and students placed the responsibility in the home. The teachers indicated a joint home/school responsibility.

Item #8: Develop Pride in Work and Feeling of Self-Worth. All three groups indicated an "average" successlevel -- the students indicating a more positive level thanthe other two groups. All three groups indicated a joint school/home responsibility.

Item #9: Learn to Use Leisure Time. The community indicated an "average" level of success. The students and teachers were in strong disagreement with the teachers indicating a "below average" level and the students an "above average" level. There was agreement, however, in the joint responsibility of the school and the home.

Item #10: Practice and Understand the Ideas of Health and Safety. The three groups agreed in an "average" success level and that the goal was the joint responsibility of the home and the school.

Item #11: Learn Good Citizenship. The teachers and students indicated a slight positive level of success and the community a slight negative level of success. All three placed the responsibility in both the home and the school.

Item #12: Appreciation of Culture and Beauty in the World. The teachers indicated a "below average" level of success with the community and students indicating an "average" level. There was agreement as to the responsibility of the goal -- the school and the home.

TEACHER NEEDS ASSESSMENT

In order to provide an appropriate data base for developing a master plan complying with Article II, Section 2 and 5, of the staff development guidelines,[20] an opinionnaire[21] was developed to determine the priorities of teachers' professional needs. The following eighteen innovations, techniques, and/or needs were identified:

Individualized instruction strategies

Team teaching

Programmed instruction

Non-graded school approach

Alternative education programs

Grading systems

---

[20]"Staff Development."

[21]See Appendix F, pp. 37, 38, 39, 40.

Sensitivity training

Techniques for diagnosing student reading problems

Techniques for dealing with students' cultural differences

Values clarification

Role of behavioral objectives

Career education

Dealing with handicapped children in the classroom

Performance contracting

Teacher accountability

Communication

Curriculum

Physical facilities

Teachers were asked to respond to the above with respect to the need for and the methods of implementation. Eight methods of implementation were provided:

Workshop

Small informal group

College course

Personal project

Professional visitation

Travel

Sabbatical

Leave of absence for professional growth

Population for Needs Assessment

The professional staff of the three districts comprising the Union was identified and utilized as the population for this assessment.[22] A ten percent, simple random sample was selected from each of the three strata. The identified population was 244, thus the size of the sample was 25.

Administration of the Needs Assessment Instruments

The needs assessment instruments were delivered to the various schools and selected teachers on December 17, 1974. Two days later the completed instruments were collected. Each instrument was coded so that a follow-up could be conducted to ensure a high return rate. However, follow-up procedures were not necessary due to a 96 percent return rate (N = 24).

Analysis of Data

Weighted Means of the Needs. To establish dissimilarity of opinions of the teachers toward the eighteen needs items identified, a mean score was calculated as follows: the total of responses under each item variable was multiplied by a variable number from +2 to -2. The sum of products of the five intervals was divided by the total number of responses (N) carried out to the nearest thousandth. For example, using Item 1, "Individualized Instruction Strategies," the mean was calculated as shown in Table IV. Similarly, means for each item were computed to provide the means which were used to compare the opinions of the teachers in reporting the data relevant to the questions under examination.[23]

---

[22] A list of the professional staff by district, school, and position was provided by the Superintendent of Schools.

[23] See Appendix G, pp. 41, 42.

TABLE IV

MEAN SCORE CALCULATED FOR ITEM 1

Scale Variable	Greatest Need (+2)	Need (+1)	No Opinion (0)	No Need (-1)	Least Need (-2)	Product Sum
Total Teacher Responses (N = 24)	7	13	0	1	3	
PRODUCT	14	13	0	-1	-6	20

Mean = Sum of Products (+20)
divided by total responses (24) = +0.833

Percentages for Implementation. To establish priorities of implementation for each of the eighteen needs items, percentages of responses were determined. Percentages for each item were computed to provide priorities as to which methods of implementation were desired for each item.[24]

[24] See Appendix H, pp. 43, 44.

Data Relevant to Questions Asked

Greatest Need. The teachers indicated a "greatest need" level for item 16, "Communication (Exchange of ideas between teachers, administration, school board, and community)." Fifty percent of the teachers indicated "Workshop" as the method of implementation. Thirty-three percent suggested "Small informal group."

Need. Seven areas were placed in the "Need" level by the teachers (listed by level of priority):

Curriculum

Techniques for Diagnosing Student Reading Problems

Dealing with Handicapped Children in the Classroom

Individualized Instruction Strategies

Alternative Education Programs

Career Education

Team Teaching Techniques

The "Workshop" was suggested as the means of implementing the following four areas:

Individualized Instruction Strategies

Techniques for Diagnosing Student Reading Problems

Career Education

Curriculum

For the need area "Team Teaching Techniques," both "small informal groups" and "Workshop" were indicated as the methods of implementation: To meet the need "Alternative Education Programs" the following three methods of implementation were selected: "Professional Visitation," "Small informal groups," and "Personal project." "College course," "Workshop," and "Small informal group" were indicated as methods of meeting the need area "Dealing with Handicapped Children in the Classroom."

In the following three areas a slight "Need" was indicated: "Grading systems," "Values Clarification," and "Performance Contracting." "Workshop" and "Small informal group" were suggested as the methods of implementation for these three areas.

No Need. The teachers indicated "No need" in the area "Techniques for Dealing with Students' Cultural Differences." A slight "No need" was indicated for the area "Role of Behavioral Objectives."

No Opinion. The balance of the areas fell in the "No opinion" or between the "Need" and "No need" levels:

Programmed Instruction

Non-graded School Approach

Sensitivity Training

Teacher Accountability

Physical Facilities

STUDENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT

To provide objective data regarding student needs[25] in Supervisory Union No. 30, a student needs assessment instrument[26] was developed. Only objective test or diagnostic data was utilized in this survey.[27]

The following academic areas were identified to be assessed:

reading

language arts

mathematics

science

social studies

physical education

music

art

In addition, the following physical/mental health areas were identified to be assessed:

speech defects

sight

hearing

dental

physically handicapped

developmentally handicapped

---

[25]"Staff Development," Article II, Section 2.

[26]See Appendix I, pp. 45, 46.

[27]Exceptions are: physical education, music, and art. In these three areas teacher judgment was used.

Population for Needs Assessment

The students in grades K-12 of the various schools in the three districts comprising the Union were identified and utilized as the population for this assessment.[28] A ten percent, simple random sample was selected from each of the thirteen strata. The numeric size of the population was 4345; the sample size was 436.

Administration of Needs Assessment Instrument

On January 8, 1975, the needs assessment instruments, along with the guidelines[29] for the completion of the instruments, were given to the principals and/or counselors of the Union schools enrolling the selected students. In accordance with recent federal legislation and court decisions, the privacy and anonymity of the students selected were maintained.

Lists of the selected students, by schools, were given to the appropriate school principal and/or counselor, who completed a needs assessment instrument for each selected student. The completed and returned instruments contained no name or reference to students or schools. The instruments were returned to the researchers January 10, 1975. The rate of return was 95 percent (N = 412).[30]

---

[28]A list of the students, grades K-12, by district, school, and grade was provided by the Superintendent of Schools.

[29]See Appendix J, pp. 47, 48.

[30]It is important to note that while there was a very high rate of return of the individual student profiles, a large percentage of the returned needs assessment forms contained little or no test data about the individuals.

Analysis of Data

The frequency of given responses to the five items of Section II and the nine items of Section III was computed by the following grouped grade levels: K-3, 4-6, 7-9, and 10-12.[31] The responses to the items in Section II were then analyzed to determine the divergence of the data with expected frequencies of the normal distribution. Significant differences from these analyses were determined to provide conclusions pertaining to the divergence of the data at the .05 level of confidence. The nonparametric chi-square (χ^2) statistic[32] was used as a test of this significance because only frequency data were used.

The .05 percent level of significance with two degrees of freedom required a crossbreak analysis using a chi-square test of independence of 5.9915[33] to be significant. Statistical computations revealed that none of the twenty items (five items in each of the four grade groupings) were significant at the .05 percent level.[34] It was then assumed that the student frequency data did not differ significantly with the expected frequencies of the normal distribution.

The frequency data obtained in Section III was converted to percentages of the sample responding, by the four grade groupings.[35] Only in two areas did the responses indicate a need area beyond the ten percent level. Eight need areas were in the five to ten percent level. The remaining twenty-six areas were at the less than five percent level.

---

[31] See Appendix K, pp. 49, 50, 51.

[32] Downie, op. cit., pp. 205-206.

[33] Ibid., p. 311.

[34] See Appendix L, pp. 52, 53.

[35] See Appendix M, pp. 54, 55.

Data Relevant to Questions Examined

None of the five identified needs areas in Section II differed significantly with what one would expect in a normal distribution. The areas most in need in Section III were (in order of priority of need):

Sight (4-6)

Art (K-3)

Art (4-6)

Music (K-3)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Borg, Walter R., and Meredith D. Gall. Educational Research. 2d ed. New York: David McKay, 1974.

Bureau of Educational Research, University of Mississippi. Personal correspondence between Dr. Bruce Weigle and the writers. November 10, 1974.

Downie, N. M., and R. W. Heath. Basic Statistical Methods. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Gilmanton Voter Registration Check List, November, 1974.

Johnson, James A., et al. The Foundations of American Education. 2d ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1973.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. 2d ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Laconia Directory: 1974. Greenfield, Mass.: H. A. Manning Co., 1974.

"Staff Development for Educational Personnel: State of New Hampshire." Concord, N.H.: Office of Teacher Education and Professional Standards, State Department of Education, June, 1971. (Mimeographed.)

APPENDIX A

OPINIONNAIRE

PART I -- Are the local public schools successful in teaching the twelve (12) goals stated below? Please respond to all the goal statements by circling, at the right of each statement, the number which best describes your opinion according to the scale below:

SCALE 1 - Excellent 2 - Above Average 3 - Average 4 - Below Average 5 - Very Poor

1. GAIN A GENERAL EDUCATION (Background and skills in the use of numbers, natural sciences, mathematics and social sciences; basic information and concepts.) 1 2 3 4 5

2. DEVELOP SKILLS IN READING, WRITING, SPEAKING, AND LISTENING (Skills in oral and written English; ability to read with understanding and enjoyment.) 1 2 3 4 5

3. DEVELOP A DESIRE FOR LEARNING NOW AND IN THE FUTURE (Eagerness for lifelong learning.) 1 2 3 4 5

4. GAIN INFORMATION NEEDED TO MAKE JOB SELECTIONS (Ability to use information and counseling services related to the selection of a job.) 1 2 3 4 5

5. DEVELOP SKILLS TO ENTER A SPECIFIC FIELD OF WORK (Abilities and skills needed for immediate employment; awareness of opportunities.) 1 2 3 4 5

6. LEARN TO EXAMINE AND TO USE INFORMATION (Skills to think, question, and proceed logically; decision-making skills.) 1 2 3 4 5

7. UNDERSTAND AND PRACTICE THE SKILLS OF FAMILY LIVING (Awareness of future family responsibilities and achievement of skills in preparing to accept them.) 1 2 3 4 5

8. DEVELOP PRIDE IN WORK AND FEELING OF SELF-WORTH (A feeling of student pride in achievements and progress; self-understanding and self-awareness.) 1 2 3 4 5

9. LEARN TO USE LEISURE TIME (Interest and participation in a variety of leisure time activities.) 1 2 3 4 5

10. PRACTICE AND UNDERSTAND THE IDEAS OF HEALTH AND SAFETY (Understanding of good physical health and well being; concern for public health and safety.) 1 2 3 4 5

11. LEARN GOOD CITIZENSHIP (Understanding of the obligations and responsibilities of citizenship.) 1 2 3 4 5

12. APPRECIATION OF CULTURE AND BEAUTY IN THE WORLD (Abilities for effective expression of ideas and cultural appreciation of the fine arts.) 1 2 3 4 5

PART II -- Is teaching toward the twelve goals listed below a RESPONSIBILITY of the local public schools, home or both? Indicate your opinion by checking the appropriate box to the right of each of the goal statements.

		School	Name	Both
1.	GAIN A GENERAL EDUCATION	☐	☐	☐
2.	DEVELOP SKILLS IN READING, WRITING, SPEAKING, AND LISTENING	☐	☐	☐
3.	DEVELOP A DESIRE FOR LEARNING NOW AND IN THE FUTURE	☐	☐	☐
4.	GAIN INFORMATION NEEDED TO MAKE JOB SELECTIONS	☐	☐	☐
5.	DEVELOP SKILLS TO ENTER A SPECIFIC FIELD OF WORK	☐	☐	☐
6.	LEARN TO EXAMINE AND TO USE INFORMATION	☐	☐	☐
7.	UNDERSTAND AND PRACTICE THE SKILLS OF FAMILY LIVING	☐	☐	☐
8.	DEVELOP PRIDE IN WORK AND FEELING OF SELF-WORTH	☐	☐	☐
9.	LEARN TO USE LEISURE TIME	☐	☐	☐
10.	PRACTICE AND UNDERSTAND THE IDEAS OF HEALTH AND SAFETY	☐	☐	☐
11.	LEARN GOOD CITIZENSHIP	☐	☐	☐
12.	APPRECIATION OF CULTURE AND BEAUTY IN THE WORLD	☐	☐	☐

PART IV -- Additional comments may be made and will be welcomed below.

APPENDIX B

OBSERVED RESPONSES TO OPINIONNAIRE BY COMMUNITY, TEACHERS, AND STUDENTS

OBSERVED RESPONSES TO OPINIONNAIRE

ITEMS BY COMMUNITY

Opinionnaire Statement Number	Part II Responses					Part III Responses		
	1	2	3	4	5	School	Home	Both
1	20	58	130	8	5	73	3	176
2	19	46	111	41	6	101	0	153
3	9	44	114	39	13	24	7	224
4	10	32	103	57	13	96	6	148
5	10	25	110	57	13	155	3	93
6	7	48	131	28	6	81	3	169
7	5	26	98	72	16	1	70	182
8	11	40	122	42	7	4	13	237
9	6	49	104	50	10	6	47	201
10	10	45	117	41	7	8	10	237
11	9	40	115	47	11	15	5	234
12	7	39	110	51	12	10	4	238

OBSERVED RESPONSES TO OPINIONNAIRE

ITEMS BY TEACHERS

Opinionnaire Statement Number	Part II Responses					Part III Responses		
	1	2	3	4	5	School	Home	Both
1	1	10	10	3	0	3	0	21
2	2	6	12	4	0	13	0	11
3	0	4	16	4	0	2	0	22
4	2	5	13	3	1	10	1	13
5	0	3	10	10	0	13	1	10
6	1	3	14	4	2	8	0	16
7	0	2	13	7	1	0	2	22
8	1	4	15	3	1	1	0	23
9	0	5	9	9	1	0	2	22
10	2	3	14	5	0	0	1	23
11	2	4	14	4	0	0	1	22
12	0	2	13	6	3	1	0	23

OBSERVED RESPONSES TO OPINIONNAIRE

ITEMS BY STUDENTS

Opinionnaire Statement Number	Part II Responses					Part III Responses		
	1	2	3	4	5	School	Home	Both
1	22	96	75	3	1	78	5	113
2	30	64	77	26	0	99	4	94
3	16	47	84	44	6	49	17	131
4	26	66	68	28	6	67	20	109
5	10	67	70	41	8	115	13	68
6	20	69	86	21	1	106	9	80
7	11	38	82	51	15	2	112	83
8	17	59	88	24	8	20	32	145
9	31	56	70	24	16	20	47	128
10	18	52	83	33	11	28	25	143
11	13	50	82	44	8	22	32	143
12	23	39	73	45	17	35	26	135

APPENDIX C

COMPUTED CHI-SQUARE DISTRIBUTION TO RESPONSES OF COMMUNITY, TEACHERS, AND STUDENTS

PART I ITEMS		PART II ITEMS	
Item Number	Computed X^2	Item Number	Computed X^2
1	36.231	1	13.061
2	20.466	2	12.394
3	13.235	3	33.542
4	39.502	4	12.744
5	38.109	5	9.727
6	30.266	6	32.961
7	11.516	7	51.480
8	15.553	8	37.841
9	41.532	9	21.127
10	12.036	10	37.463
11	9.060	11	39.839
12	21.226	12	56.912

APPENDIX D

ITEM WEIGHTED MEAN OF RESPONDENTS

ON OPINIONNAIRE

PART I ITEMS

ITEM NUMBER	COMMUNITY	TEACHERS	STUDENTS
1	+0.362	+0.375	+0.685
2	+0.139	+0.250	+0.498
3	-0.014	0.000	+0.117
4	-0.144	+0.167	+0.402
5	-0.177	-0.304	+0.153
6	+0.100	-0.125	+0.437
7	-0.313	-0.304	-0.107
8	+0.027	+0.042	+0.270
9	+0.014	-0.333	+0.315
10	+0.046	+0.083	+0.168
11	-0.050	+0.167	+0.081
12	-0.101	-0.417	+0.031

PART II ITEMS

ITEM NUMBER	COMMUNITY	TEACHERS	STUDENTS
1	+0.277	+0.125	+0.372
2	+0.398	+0.542	+0.482
3	+0.067	+0.083	+0.162
4	+0.360	+0.375	+0.240
5	+0.606	+0.500	+0.520
6	+0.308	+0.333	+0.497
7	-0.273	-0.083	-0.558
8	-0.035	+0.047	-0.061
9	-0.161	-0.083	-0.139
10	-0.008	-0.042	+0.015
11	+0.039	-0.044	-0.051
12	+0.008	+0.042	+0.046

APPENDIX E

DISCREPANT AREAS

DISCREPANT AREAS

Community		Teachers		Students	
Part I	Part II	Part I	Part II	Part I	Part II
7	5	12	2	7	5
5	2	9	5	12	6
4	4	7	4	5	2
12	6	5	6	11	1

APPENDIX F

TEACHER NEEDS ASSESSMENT FORM

SUPERVISORY UNION #30

PRIORITY QUESTIONNAIRE OF TEACHERS' NEEDS

District (circle one)

Laconia
Gilford
Gilmanton

Level (circle one)

Elementary
Middle School
Junior High
High School

Purpose: The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine the priorities of teachers' needs in your teaching district in order to improve our educational system.

Directions: Please use the Needs Scale by circling the number that is appropriate.

Please use the Implementation Code to circle the method that you wish to use in order to meet this need. If you circle O, please write in the method you desire.

Needs Scale

1. Greatest need
2. Need
3. No opinion
4. No need
5. Least need

Implementation Code

W - Workshop
G - Small informal group
CC - College course
P - Personal project
V - Professional Visitation
T - Travel
S - Sabbatical
L - Leave of Absence for Professional Growth
O - Other

1. Individualized Instruction Strategies (Different techniques for teaching while still providing for individual differences).

   Need: 1 2 3 4 5 Implementation: W G CC P V T S L O

2. Team Teaching Techniques (A system in which two or more teachers plan and work together.

   Need: 1 2 3 4 5 Implementation: W G CC P V T S L O

3. Programmed Instruction (A method of presenting material in a logical manner. Printed solutions to problems or questions are provided immediately and provisions are made for remedial steps if necessary).

   Need: 1 2 3 4 5 Implementation: W G CC P V T S L O

Needs Scale

1. Greatest need
2. Need
3. No opinion
4. No need
5. Least need

Implementation Code

W - Workshop
G - Small informal group
CC - College course
P - Personal project
V - Professional Visitation
T - Travel
S - Sabbatical
L - Leave of Absence for Professional Growth
O - Other

4. Non-graded School Approach (Students are assigned to a level or block instead of a grade. Students may spend 3 or 4 years in a level or block advancing according to their physical, social, emotional and intellectual maturity to the next level or block).

Need: 1 2 3 4 5 Implementation: W G CC P V T S L O

5. Alternative Education Programs (This provides an opportunity for students to be able to pursue other areas of study whether they are or are not part of the basic curriculum).

Need: 1 2 3 4 5 Implementation: W G CC P V T S L O

6. Grading Systems (The examination of techniques, methods and styles for student evaluation, plus the reassessment of our current systems).

Need: 1 2 3 4 5 Implementation: W G CC P V T S L O

7. Sensitivity Training (Becoming more aware of yourself - how and why you interact with others).

Need: 1 2 3 4 5 Implementation: W G CC P V T S L O

8. Techniques for Diagnosing Student Reading Problems (To examine available techniques. To provide teachers with the opportunity to refresh their ideas and become aware of new methods.

Need: 1 2 3 4 5 Implementation: W G CC P V T S L O

9. Techniques for Dealing With Students' Cultural Differences (How to deal with children from different environments, socio-economic backgrounds, languages, religions, and geographical locations).

Need: 1 2 3 4 5 Implementation: W G CC P V T S L O

10. Values Clarification (A clarification of one's own personal values - one identifies, accepts and relates to others in situations).

Need: 1 2 3 4 5 Implementation: W G CC P V T S L O

Needs Scale

1. Greatest need
2. Need
3. No opinion
4. No need
5. Least need

Implementation Code

W - Workshop
G - Small informal group
CC - College course
P - Personal Project
V - Professional Visitation
T - Travel
S - Sabbatical
L - Leave of Absence for Professional Growth
O - Other

11. Role of Behavioral Objectives (How to plan, write, and measure behavioral objectives).

Need: 1 2 3 4 5 Implementation: W G CC I V T S L O

12. Career Education (An exploration of the various jobs available, job descriptions and teaching techniques in occupational fields).

Need: 1 2 3 4 5 Implementation: W G CC P V T S L O

13. Dealing with Handicapped Children in the Classroom (Making arrangements for any child with an emotional, social, physical or intellectual handicap).

Need: 1 2 3 4 5 Implementation: W G CC P V T S L O

14. Performance Contracting (Creating actual contracts between students and a teacher stating the objectives the student plans to achieve along with the methods he will use).

Need: 1 2 3 4 5 Implementation: W G CC P V T S L O

15. Teacher Accountability (An in-depth study of the teacher's role and his or her responsibility to the school and community).

Need: 1 2 3 4 5 Implementation: W G CC P V T S L O

16. Communication (Exchange of ideas between teachers, administration, school board, and community).

Need: 1 2 3 4 5 Implementation: W G CC P V T S L O

17. Curriculum (Methods of evaluating, changing and/or developing curriculum).

Need: 1 2 3 4 5 Implementation: W G CC P V T S L O

18. Physical Facilities (Changing or developing existing physical facilities).

Need: 1 2 3 4 5 Implementation: W G CC P V T S L O

APPENDIX G

ITEM WEIGHTED MEAN OF RESPONSES TO

TEACHER NEEDS ASSESSMENT FORM

Item Number	Teacher Responses
1	+0.833
2	+0.583
3	+0.167
4	+0.261
5	+0.609
6	+0.391
7	-0.044
8	+0.913
9	-0.565
10	+0.364
11	-0.391
12	+0.609
13	+0.913
14	+0.348
15	+0.174
16	+1.565
17	+1.217
18	+0.087

APPENDIX H

PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES TO METHODS OF IMPLEMENTATION

Item Number	No Response	Implementation Methods W	G	CC	P	V	T	S	L	Other
1	17	46	17	12	0	4	0	0	0	4
2	12	33	37	0	12	4	0	0	0	0
3	37	37	4	12	4	0	0	0	0	4
4	33	37	4	8	8	8	0	0	0	0
5	25	12	21	0	17	25	0	0	0	0
6	25	42	21	4	0	4	0	0	0	4
7	37	29	17	8	4	0	0	0	0	4
8	12	46	4	25	0	8	0	0	0	4
9	29	37	12	8	4	4	4	0	0	0
10	29	29	25	12	4	0	0	0	0	0
11	29	42	8	17	4	0	0	0	0	0
12	21	42	0	17	0	17	0	0	0	4
13	8	25	21	29	4	8	0	0	0	4
14	25	50	12	4	8	0	0	0	0	0
15	29	37	21	4	4	0	0	0	0	4
16	12	50	33	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
17	17	54	8	17	0	4	0	0	0	0
18	42	17	17	0	8	17	0	0	0	0

APPENDIX I

STUDENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT FORM

STUDENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT
SUPERVISORY UNION #30

SECTION I

Grade _____

Sex _____

School District:
Gilford _____
Gilmanton _____
Laconia _____

SECTION II

Only standardized objective test data will be used in determining student needs

NEEDS AREAS	STANDARDIZED TESTS OR DIAGNOSTIC SCREENING		
	Below	Average	Above
Reading			
Language Arts			
Mathematics			
Science			
Social Studies			

SECTION III

Physical Education	
Music	
Art	
Speech Defects	
Sight	
Hearing	
Dental	
Physically Handicapped	
Developmentally Handicapped	

_____
Signature of individual making Assessment

APPENDIX J

GUIDELINES FOR STUDENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Standard Scores	Below Group	Average Group	Above Group
standard deviation	-4 to -1	-1 to +1	+1 to +4
percentile	0 to 16	16 to 84	84 to 100
Z-score	-4 to -1	-1 to +1	+1 to +4
T-score	10 to 40	40 to 60	60 to 90
stanine	1 & 2	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	8 & 9
C-score	0, 1, 2	3, 4, 5, 6	7, 8, 9, 10
sten	1, 2, 3	4, 5, 6, 7	8, 9, 10

APPENDIX K

RESPONSES TO SECTION II AND III OF

STUDENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT FORM

GRADES K-3

Section II				Section III	
Item Number	Below	Average	Above	Item Number	Frequency
1	10	42	24	1	8
2	5	49	9	2	10
3	6	54	21	3	17
4	2	14	5	4	9
5	1	16	5	5	6
				6	5
				7	3
				8	0
				9	2

GRADES 4-6

Section II				Section III	
Item Number	Below	Average	Above	Item Number	Frequency
1	10	54	13	1	5
2	11	53	13	2	5
3	11	53	12	3	7
4	9	46	11	4	0
5	7	49	12	5	13
				6	2
				7	3
				8	1
				9	1

GRADES 7-9

	Section II				Section II
Item Number	Below	Average	Above	Item Number	Frequency
1	14	70	21	1	0
2	16	69	20	2	0
3	17	63	24	3	0
4	15	70	20	4	2
5	11	73	20	5	2
				6	6
				7	0
				8	1
				9	2

GRADES 10-12

	Section II				Section II
Item Number	Below	Average	Above	Item Number	Frequency
1	10	78	14	1	2
2	14	70	18	2	0
3	13	75	12	3	0
4	10	73	13	4	3
5	12	69	15	5	4
				6	1
				7	3
				8	1
				9	2

APPENDIX L

COMPUTED CHI SQUARE DISTRIBUTION TO

RESPONSES TO SECTION II ITEMS AND NORMAL DISTRIBUTION

GRADES K-3

Item Number	Computed X^2
1	5.246
2	2.111
3	4.477*
4	0.734*
5	2.044*

GRADES 4-6

Item Number	Computed X^2
1	0.231
2	0.083
3	0.083
4	0.244
5	1.027

GRADES 7-9

Item Number	Computed X^2
1	0.713
2	0.302
3	1.668
4	0.375
5	1.552

GRADES 10-12

Item Number	Computed X^2
1	1.950
2	0.251
3	0.955
4	1.495
5	0.400

*Four cells have an expected frequency of less than five. The chi-square computed may not be reliable.

APPENDIX M

PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES TO ITEMS IN SECTION III

ITEM NUMBER	PERCENTAGE K-3	4-6	7-9	10-12
1	7.08	6.41	0.00	1.94
2	8.85	6.41	0.00	0.00
3	15.04	8.97	0.00	0.00
4	7.97	0.00	1.85	2.91
5	5.31	16.67	1.85	3.88
6	4.43	2.56	5.56	0.97
7	2.66	3.85	0.00	2.91
8	0.00	1.28	0.93	0.97
9	1.77	1.28	1.85	1.94